

**VIERRA MAGEN
MARCUS & DENIRO LLP**
*INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW*575 MARKET ST. • SUITE 2500
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2871
TELEPHONE 415.369.9660
FACSIMILE 415.369.9665
WWW.VIERRAMAGEN.COM**FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL**

TO: Examiner Wei	FROM: Ronald M. Pomerence, Esq.
COMPANY: USPTO	DATE: December 6, 2011
FAX NUMBER: 571-270-2059	TOTAL NO. OF PAGES, INCLUDING COVER: 3
PHONE NUMBER:	SENDER'S REFERENCE NUMBER: WILY-01013US0
RE: Proposed claim amendments	YOUR REFERENCE NUMBER: Application No. 10/700,338

IF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE ALL PAGES, PLEASE CALL: RONALD POMERENKE AT 415.369.9660.

NOTES/COMMENTS:

NOTICE: THIS FACSIMILE IS CONFIDENTIAL AND MAY BE ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED, WORK PRODUCT, AND/OR OTHERWISE EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. THIS FACSIMILE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE ADDRESSEE AND THOSE AUTHORIZED BY THE ADDRESSEE TO RECEIVE IT. ANY USE, DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS FACSIMILE BY ANY OTHERS IS PROHIBITED. ANY OTHERS RECEIVING THIS FACSIMILE ARE REQUESTED TO NOTIFY VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS & DENIRO LLP IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE OR FAX AND TO RETURN THE ORIGINAL FACSIMILE TO VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS & DENIRO LLP.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application)	PATENT APPLICATION
)	
Inventors: Cirne et al.)	
)	Art Unit: 2192
Application No.: 10/700,338)	
)	Examiner: Wei, Zheng
Filed: November 3, 2003)	
)	
Title: SIMPLE METHOD OPTIMIZATION)	
)	<u>Customer No. 28554</u>

EXAMINER INTERVIEW AGENDA

The Applicants would like to discuss the following during the telephonic interview scheduled for December 7, 2PM eastern.

1. (Proposed amendment) A process for monitoring, comprising:
accessing a method;

automatically determining whether to modify said method, said step of automatically determining whether to modify said method includes automatically determining whether said method calls another method and if said method has an access level that satisfies a criterion; and

modifying said method for a particular purpose only if said method calls another method and said access level satisfies the criterion.

- Applicants respectfully assert that *Berkley* in view of *Webster* in further view of *Grove* fails to disclose, “*modifying said method for a particular purpose only if said method calls another method and said access level satisfies the criterion*,” as claimed.
- Applicants will discuss an example referring to FIG. 4 of their disclosure.

- 1 -

Attorney Docket No.: WILY-01013US0
wily/1013/1013.Ei agenda - Copy.doc

- Applicants will briefly discuss page 686 of *“A Framework for Call Graph Construction Algorithms* (David Grove and Craig Chambers) (herein “*Grove and Chambers*”), which discusses problems with constructing call graphs. Applicants have invented a solution that does not require that a call graph be constructed. Rather, the Applicants have discovered that a much simpler solution is possible.
- Applicants will briefly discuss why *Berkley* in view of *Webster* in further view of *Grove* does not disclose the claim limitations.
 - *Berkley* discloses monitoring classes in an object-oriented environment. First, there is the issue that *Berkley* monitors **classes**. Second, there is the issue that merely teaching how to construct a call graph does not lead one to the claimed solution of what methods are modified in claim 1.
 - *Webster* discloses allowing a user to provide a list of methods to trace. Merely teaching how to construct a call graph does not lead one to the solution of **that a method should be added to the list only if said method calls another method and said access level satisfies the criterion**.

Ronald M. Pomerence

Reg. No. 43,009

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS & DENIRO LLP
575 Market Street, Suite 2500
San Francisco, California 94105-4206
Telephone: (415) 369-9660
Facsimile: (415) 369-9665

- 2 -

Attorney Docket No.: WILY-01013US0
wily/1013/1013.Ei agenda - Copy.doc